

6/19

Buildings 865 and 883 Beryllium Removal Work Agreement

The Site had been pursuing removal of Beryllium (Be) contaminated items in buildings 865 and 883 through the use of an Operations Order. The Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) representative had been reluctant under the consultative process, to allow the work to proceed without preparation of Integrated Work Control Program (IWCP) documents. This came to a head when the proposed work was found to include removal of equipment connected to a vacuum system similar to a dust collection system. Under the Decommissioning Program Plan (DPP) such equipment could be considered "fixed equipment connected to building systems" requiring a Rocky Flats Cleanup Agreement Decision Document unless under DPP Section 1.1.5 the parties reach a case by case agreement to remove said equipment without a decision document. Such an agreement was reached when the Site agreed to prepare IWCP documents.

Program Contact: Steve Tower, x2133

From Tower  
DOE

TO DORR.  
KH  
K.A. [Signature]



6/20

800 Type 1s - list of Bldgs to be included in the 1 report

865 Be work removal. Property removal  
Letter to Tower - in the AR. mtg minutes - path forward.  
e mail to Dave K. 2 state.

Best Available Copy

Gary K. IWCP for Be work.

Nesta - Contact Document. 1/6

DOCUMENT CLASSIFICATION  
REVIEW WAIVER PER  
CLASSIFICATION OFFICE

ADMIN 1234567890  
B883-A-000001

OG - 16-2000

<u>Name</u>	<u>Company</u>	<u>Phone</u>
Gary Konwinski	RFCSS	2729
STEVE TOWN	PCR	2133
David Krueh	CDPHE	692-3328
KENT DORR	KA	6034
John Bende,	RIS	4195
Steve Nesta	RIS/KH	6384

## ISSUE PAPER REGARDING B865/883 WORK ACTIVITIES

A meeting was held on May 31, 2000 with CDPHE, DOE and Kaiser-Hill (Attachment 1 identifies attendees) to discuss the State's comments on the Beryllium report for B865 and B883. The report was prepared in August 1999 and was sent to the State, at some point, for informational purposes only. The report was prepared as part of the Site response to the implementation of the Chronic Beryllium Disease Program for worker safety. It was not meant to be a deliverable to the State for activities conducted in B865 or B883. While not in an official capacity, per se, the State decided to offer their comments in order to help with future documents that may be prepared as official deliverables.

The State's comments were meaningful with respect to the quality of the document that they received. They pointed out inconsistencies within document and how the information could be better laid out to relate the analysis information in the attachments to the body of the text. Mr. Tower from DOE stated that we welcomed any and all comments from the State and in fact would send them and solicit their comments on any future work documents. I believed this to mean that we would make our work documents available for the State's review. However, it appeared from the ensuing conversation that the State really would like to be involved in our work documents and thus more involved in the ongoing routine operations.

It also became apparent during the conversations that Mr. Kruchek was still questioning whether or not the work being done in the subject buildings was still "Hazard Reduction" and outside the jurisdiction of the DPP. Because this was at least the second time I had heard this reference made by the State, I delved into the issue some. Several issues have been identified:

- H.R. ① The work done to date in the buildings has been done as part of hazard reduction and employee safety, and probably warrants that designation.
2. Contact record dated June 15, 1999 indicates that the B865/883 outbuildings had been removed "under deactivation and in the spirit of RFCA consultative process" and that a "Reconnaissance Level Characterization and Final Survey Report (following the DPP)" had been completed. The report in question has been identified as a radiological survey. Based on the rad results, many of the outbuildings referenced in the June 15, 1999 Contact Record have been eliminated. Of the six listed facilities, only the Sutton Extrusion Press Switchgear remains; the rest of the facilities had had a PRE conducted for release. However, since there exists paperwork that invokes the DPP, my recommendation would be to capture all of the aforementioned paperwork including any work packages and include them in the AR.
- ③ Contact record dated January 19, 2000 indicates that removal of the house vacuum system was discussed. The record states that the ventilation system was being removed pursuant to the DPP and that the contact record constituted the consultative process for that activity. Again, this contact record needs to be part of the AR as well as any other work documents related to the house vacuum system.
4. Based upon my review, the activities needing to be conducted in these facilities in the future would fall within the descriptions of Sections 1.1.4 and 1.1.5 of the DPP. Future activities would involve "removing fixed equipment and systems [as described in Section 1.1.5] to facilitate performance of the reconnaissance level characterization survey, to promote timely disposition of excess useable equipment or the disposition of waste and to use available building manpower in an efficient manner."

Further,

Send to A.R.

*For the purposes of this section, fixed equipment and systems means those items that are attached to the floor or walls or ceiling of a building, but which are not connected to building systems, such as plumbing or ventilation, that could reasonably be expected to provide a pathway for contaminants to reach the environment. Fixed equipment may be connected to utilities that do not provide such a pathway, such as electrical or telephone systems. As examples, fixed equipment includes machinery that is bolted or otherwise attached to floors or walls, cabinets, lockers, benches and electrical panels. Fixed equipment under this section also includes items such as hoods, gloveboxes and tanks that may have been attached to the building but never connected to building ventilation or plumbing systems. On a case-by-case basis, fixed equipment that is connected to building systems may be removed pursuant to this section of the DPP, with the agreement of the parties. Otherwise, the need for a RFCA decision or decision document for systems that have been connected, but which are uncontaminated, and for attached equipment inside of gloveboxes will be determined per Section 1.1.4. Pursuant to this section, DOE may remove fixed equipment and systems as defined herein, regardless whether or not such equipment is contaminated with radiological or hazardous substances.*

The next activities that the building personnel have scheduled involve the removal of the house vacuum system and the removal of the restroom fixtures. The first activity is guided by the aforementioned contact record. The latter activity is one that has the potential to create a pathway to the environment via the sanitary sewage system. I believe that we need to invoke the DPP for this and all future actions pertaining to these buildings. Hence, project personnel should prepare a letter for submittal to the CDPHE to begin the consultative process for these activities.

**Dorr, Kent**

**From:** Tower, Steven  
**Sent:** Friday, June 02, 2000 1:07 PM  
**To:** Dorr, Kent  
**Cc:** Legare, Joe; Rampe, John; McCormick, Matthew; DiSalvo, Richard; Gerdeman, Fred; Stevens, Jeffrey  
**Subject:** Re: FW: Be contamination B865 & B883

I agree you can proceed, simply calling something D&D does not invoke additional work as this work is covered by the DPP, see Section 1.1.5. You don't have to do anything more than you were planning to do as of right now. I will forward you by separate email the definitions as established by John Rampe on D&D work. Although what I heard yesterday seems to be somewhat crosswise with these definitions and the DPP, I can't get further clarification until he returns, I have proposed a meeting for June 19 with the RFFO players.

Now as to whether the vacuum system connection throws you into the separate decision document world i.e. IM/IRA or PAM, depends on the determination, by me per the DPP in consultation with the LRA, as to whether the vacuum connection presents a "substantial threat of release" to the environment. Rick DiSalvo tells me the courts have given the regulators wide latitude in deciding this issue i.e. we may lose if we fight because they can say what is really a very small threat of release is substantial and win although the DPP further clarifies this issue and gives them less latitude, maybe. An argument on our side is that what we are removing is Be which is AEA regulated or is "otherwise regulated" in DPP space. We should continue the consultative process and meet with Dave Kruchek and maybe Steve Tarlton informally and convince them that this is hazard reduction not decommissioning and the project should proceed as originally envisioned under the DPP.

**From:** Kent Dorr/RFFO1/USDOE@EXCHANGE on 06/02/2000 01:31 PM  
**To:** Steven Tower/AMEC/DMTP/rffo@RFFO  
**cc:**  
**Subject:** FW: Be contamination B865 & B883

Now what? I am not going to develop a RLC Report for Hazardous removal work. I still believe that I can remove the shop equipment from the mtce shop and house vacuum system w/o a State approval. Let me know.  
Thanks.  
Kent Dorr, Kaiser-Hill, RISS  
X6034, Pager 212-2403.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** David Kruchek [SMTP:dakruche@smtpgate.dphe.state.co.us]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 02, 2000 10:15 AM  
**To:** kent.dorr@rfets.gov; steven.tower@rfets.gov  
**Cc:** gary.konwinski@rfets.gov; Steve Tarlton  
**Subject:** Be contamination B865 & B883

After our meeting on May 31, 2000 I looked over the building drawings provided. I noticed that the floor plan for B865 is dated 6-27-69, and B883 is 10-10-88.

The drawing for B883 is recent enough that I was able to identify all of the rooms except Room 1, which I believe is in the basement. If this is not correct please let me know.

However the drawing for B865 is apparently too old to be of much use, as the interior of the building has been changed, and I can not locate most of the rooms of concern. I would appreciate it if I could get a recent drawing showing the current configuration and room #s of the interior of Building 865. I will be out at the Flats next week (Monday) and I could either stop by to pick it up, or you can place it in my cubicle in T124A (#57 in the NW corner of the trailer).

As we discussed at the meeting, please send me responses and/or the actions to be performed in response to my comments/concerns.

Also, now that I think we all agree that the actions being performed in these buildings are D&D actions, and the Be Characterization performed is not sufficient to support D&D, please provide the specific information needed to support D&D. It would seem to me that the Reconnaissance level Characterization may be needed prior to performing additional D&D activities. I would appreciate being provided a copy of the proposed RLC Plan for these buildings.